

REMARKS

In response to the Final Rejection, Applicant is submitting a Request for Continued Examination herewith. Accordingly, it is requested that this amendment be entered.

Double Patenting

The Examiner's only rejection in the Final Rejection is a provisional rejection of Claim 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of copending application no. 09/747,646.

While Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended Claim 10 to clarify the layout of TFTs in the light emitting device of the claimed invention.

Applicant believes this overcomes the double patenting rejection and respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new Claims 97-136 herewith. For at least the below reasons, these claims should be entered and allowed in the present application.

New Independent Claims 97 and 98 are similar to amended Claim 10. These claims are supported, for example, by the Embodiment mode in the specification and Fig. 3 of the present application.

New Independent Claims 99 and 100 are similar to claims 97 and 98 but also include the limitation of "adjacent pixels have linear symmetry with a power source supply line as a center". These claims are supported, for example, by Embodiment 9 of the specification and Fig. 15A of the

present application.

New Independent Claims 101 and 102 are similar claims 97 and 98 but also include the limitation of "said first EL driver TFT and said second EL driver TFT are driven within a linear region in a digital driving method". These claims are supported, for example, by Embodiment 13 of the specification of the present application.

New Independent Claims 103 and 104 are similar to Claims 97 and 98 but also include the limitation of "said first EL driver TFT and said second EL driver TFT are driven within a saturation region in an analog driving method". These claims are also supported by Embodiment 13 of the specification of the present application.

Accordingly, it is requested that these new claims be entered and allowed. Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any fee due for these new claims.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this submission, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 1, 2003


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500